

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the Title of the invention has been further amended to delete the word "the" and thereby remove possible lack of antecedent support issues.

In addition, various of the claims have been amended to further improve form. No new matter is presented.

Approval and entry of the foregoing title and claim amendments are respectfully requested.

ITEM 3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 13 UNDER 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 13 under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite and unclear because of the recitation "portions" in the claims. In the response filed August 8, 2003, claims 2 and 13 were amended to overcome the rejection but, in retrospect, applicants feel that the amendatory corrections did not achieve the intended results and, accordingly, claims 2 and 13 have been further amended herein and are now believed to be free of § 112, ¶ 2 objections.

The same amendments as in claims 2 and 13 have also been made in claims 11 and 22.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 7-8, 12-14 AND 18-19 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 USC § 102(e) BY SHINODA ET AL. -- SUPPLEMENTAL TRAVERSE

In each of the paragraphs of item 4 directed to respective, different claims, the Examiner uniformly contends that "the bus electrode acts as a shield and shields incident light from the exterior." It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching of "shielding", much less of the bus electrode acting as a shield, in the Shinoda patent.

Shinoda discloses only a bus electrode 42 extending along a peripheral portion of a transparent electrode 41, the peripheral portion being remote from the opposing surfaces of the projecting portions of the transparent electrodes, and at which the gaseous discharge is produced in each corresponding cell.

The "shielding parts" recited in the claims, for example claim 1, are specified to be "formed on a corresponding transparent electrode and disposed laterally of the corresponding bus electrode." Clearly, the reading of the "shielding parts" on the Shinoda bus electrode 42

conflicts with the disclosed and recited structure of the plasma display panel in accordance with the invention. Claim 2/1 even more specifically recites that the shielding parts are formed in each cell "in conformity with portions having low luminescent intensity." In the rejection of claim 2/1, at page 3 of the Action, the first paragraph, the recitation of claim 2/1 is asserted to read on Figure 8 of Shinoda et al. and again particularly on the bus electrodes 42 in Fig. 8. However, there is no teaching in Shinoda of portions of each discharge cell having "low luminescent intensity" and thus no basis for the reading of claim 2/1 on the structure of Shinoda Fig. 8. Moreover, the Examiner's reading is clearly in error since requiring that the Shinoda bus electrode 42 be both a bus electrode and also a shielding part whereas the claims recite those as separate elements.

Claim 3 is rejected at page 3, again, simply based on Fig. 8 which the Examiner asserts has "transparent electrodes with a projecting part projecting to the center of the cell...."

In the case of claim 4/3, however, which recites that the shielding part is formed on the projecting part of the transparent electrode, the Examiner acknowledges the allowability of same.

It is respectfully submitted that the specific structure defined in claim 4/3 is only one embodiment of the generic teaching, recited in at least claim 2/1, of the shielding parts being formed "in conformity with portions where a discharge-generated light has a low luminescent intensity."

Nevertheless, applicants have amended the independent claims to more definitively recite that the shielding parts are disposed laterally of the bus electrodes--and, hence, clearly are not "readable" on the bus electrodes 42 of Shinoda et al. as in the present Action. Independent claim 12 has been similarly amended and new independent claim 25 is to like effect.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, each of the independent claims and their respective dependent claims is submitted to distinguish patentably over the references of record. There being no other objections or rejections, it is further submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Applicants note that an IDS has been filed concurrently with this response.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 25, 2003

By: _____

H. J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 9-26, 2003
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Michelle Spatic
Date: 9-26-03